

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified patent application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 4, 8-10, 13, 16 and 18-22 are pending in this application. Claims 13 and 19-22 are independent. Claims 3, 4, 8-10, 13, 16 and 18-22 have been rejected under § 103(a). Independent claims 19-22 and dependent claims 3, 4 and 16 have been canceled. Independent claim 13 has been amended.

Specifically, independent claim 13 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 3 and 4 and also the limitation that the peripheral device is configured to be directly operationally connected only to the inward-facing port. Support for this amendment is found in the original disclosure, e.g., in peripheral device 90 of Figure 5, a DiskOnKey™ flash memory that has a single USB port for operational connection to USB port 74.

§ 103(a) Rejections – Meng ‘399

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 8-10, 13, 16 and 18-22 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meng, US 6,231,399 (henceforth, “Meng ‘399”). The Examiner’s rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3, 16 and 19-22 have been canceled, thereby rendering moot the Examiner’s rejection of these claims.

As discussed below, claim 13 is understood to have been rendered allowable over Meng ‘399 by the inclusion therein of the limitations of claims 3 and 4. It follows that claims 8-10 and 18 that depend therefrom also are allowable over Meng ‘399.

§ 103(a) Rejections – Meng ‘399 in view of Zhu et al. ‘833

The Examiner has rejected claim 4 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meng ‘399 in view of Zhu et al., US Patent No. 6,142,833 (henceforth, “Zhu et al. ‘833”). The Examiner’s rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 has been canceled, thereby rendering moot the Examiner’s rejection of this claim. However, claim 13 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 4. Therefore, the following argument is directed at demonstrating that claim 13 is allowable over the combined teachings of Meng ‘399 and Zhu et al. ‘833.

Meng ‘399 teaches a card edge connector assembly **10** for connecting two daughter boards to a mother board of a computer. Card edge assembly **10** is connected mechanically to the mother board using boardlocks **60** and electrically to the daughter boards using opposite-facing card edge connectors **14** and **16**.

Zhu et al. ‘833 teach a connector, for a system board, that has a first USB port **21** and a second USB port **23** that face in different directions. USB port **21** is intended to be positioned at an edge of a system board. It is clear from the purpose of the invention of Zhu et al. ‘833, as stated in column 1 lines 16-25,

However, if a specific application requires the positioning of one or more of the mating ports in a front panel of a computer enclosure rather than in a rear panel thereof, the conventional connector having the ports aligned in a single parallel direction can not be used to achieve such an aim. The conventional connector has no additional port for directly electrically connecting with another electrical connector assembled to the front panel within the computer enclosure after the conventional connector is fixed to the rear panel thereof.

that USB port **23** is intended to be connected somehow to another USB port, at a different edge of the system board. Similarly, the daughter boards that Meng ‘399 connects to edge connectors **14** and **16** have other devices connected to them, because that is the function of daughter boards. By contrast, Applicant’s claim 13 recites a peripheral device that is configured to be directly operationally connected only to the

inward-facing port, and not also to some other device such as the other USB port of Zhu et al. '833. Neither Meng '399 nor Zhu et al. '833, whether taken singly or in combination (even assuming, for the sake of argument, that such combination were permissible), would teach or suggest this recitation of independent claim 13.

In view of the above amendments and remarks it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 13, and hence dependent claims 8-10 and 18 are in condition for allowance. Prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark M. Friedman
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 33,883

Date: February 11, 2008